



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/528,198	09/19/2005	Christian Bertin	127534	7021
25944 7590 12/03/2009 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850				
EXAMINER				
SAINT CYR, JEAN D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2425				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/03/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/528,198

Applicant(s)

BERTIN, CHRISTIAN

Examiner

JEAN D. SAINT CYR

Art Unit

2425

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2009.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 September 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GS/US)
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This action is in response to applicant's amendment filed on 07/28/2009. Claims 1-26 are still pending in the current application. **This action is made FINAL.**

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant amends the claims and argues that the cited references did not disclose wherein the subsequent information request comprises additional parameters including at least a time interval. For that reason, a new reference is introduced and Gordon et al disclose request from the requesting terminal may comprise, for example, a look-ahead request for programming for a time period ahead of the current time period,0050; that means the request for a content may be associated with some specific information as a time period or time interval. As a result, this action is made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7,13-14,17-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kambayashi et al in view of Gordon et al, US No. 20070089141.

Re claim 1, Kambayashi et al disclose a method of acquiring description data for broadcast audiovisual contents(see fig.1), the method comprising:

a prior step of acquiring and storing in a receiver terminal at least one initial information request(see fig.4, terminal information holding system) comprising an address of at least one audiovisual content description server(included but limited to, IP address, col.12, lines 13-23);

a step in which the receiver terminal transmits the subsequent information request to the audiovisual content description server(included but not limited to, accesses from an audience to the center and distribution of information from the center to the audience at audience's request, col.2, lines 1-3); and

a step of the receiver terminal receiving description data supplied as a function of elements of the subsequent information request(distribution of information from the center to the audience at audience's request, col.2, lines 1-3).

But Kambayashi et al did not explicitly disclose a step in which the receiver terminal generates at least one subsequent information request on the basis of the initial information request, wherein the subsequent information request comprises additional parameters including at least a time interval; wherein during the step of receiving description data, the data supplied relates to audiovisual content broadcast in the time interval specified in the subsequent information request.

However, Gordon et al disclose a step in which the receiver terminal generates at least one subsequent information request on the basis of the initial information request, wherein the subsequent information request comprises additional parameters including at least a time interval; wherein during the step of receiving description data, the data supplied relates to audiovisual content broadcast in the time interval specified in the subsequent information request(Such request from the requesting terminal may comprise, for example, a look-ahead request for programming for a time period ahead of the current time period,0050).

It would have been obvious for any person of ordinary skill in the art at that time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Gordon into the invention of Kambayashi for the purpose of making the request more specific in including more information to it.

Re claim 2, Kambayashi et al disclose wherein during the step of receiving description data, audiovisual content description data is supplied as a function of a relationship between at least one date and time associated with the subsequent information request and the broadcast date and time of the contents (see fig.23, broadcast time screen).

Re claim 3, Kambayashi et al disclose wherein the date and time associated with the subsequent information request corresponds to the date and time at which the subsequent information request is transmitted (terminal time and event ID contained in the terminal information, col.13,lines 34-35).

Re claim 4, Kambayashi et al disclose wherein, the subsequent information request as transmitted is identical to the initial request (causing the processor to transmit the ID of the event and the terminal information to the broadcasting station server through a two-way communication line based on the acquired destination information, col.7, lines 35-38).

Re claim 5, Kambayashi et al disclose wherein during the step of generating the subsequent information request, the initial request is extended by specifying at least one date and time (see fig.7, distribution time).

Re claim 6, Kambayashi et al disclose wherein, during the step of receiving description data, the data supplied is that corresponding to audiovisual content broadcast at the date and time specified in the subsequent information request (Upon receiving the event ID from the event acquisition section 2d-1, the event generation

section 2d-2 reads terminal information such as the currently-selected channel information, the terminal ID of the receiving terminal 2, the present time, terminal time, and location,col.12, lines 24-28).

Re claim 7, Kambayashi et al disclose wherein during the step of generating the subsequent information request, the initial request is expanded by specifying a number of content items and in that during the step of receiving description data, the data supplied corresponds to the requested number of audiovisual content items broadcast starting from the date and time specified in the subsequent information request (see fig.25, element 2a-4, event starting section; included but not limited to, the number of accessing receiving terminals 2 is counted,col.20, lines 33-46).

Re claim 13, Kambayashi et al disclose , wherein the initial request is downloaded from a description server (included but not limited to, see fig.1, element 1b; the program information is previously downloaded from the broadcasting station server 1c to the information storage unit 2e of the receiving terminal, col.19, and lines 62-64).

Re claim 14, Kambayashi et al disclose wherein the prior step of acquiring and storing an initial step comprises the receiver terminal receiving said initial request via a signaling channel associated with an audiovisual content broadcast channel (see fig.1).

Re claim 17, Kambayashi et al disclose wherein the subsequent information request is associated with a single audiovisual content broadcast channel (see fig.7, channel 1; that means every request has a channel associated with it).

Re claim 18, Kambayashi et al disclose wherein during the step of generating the subsequent information request, a set of broadcast channels is defined , and in that during the step in which the receiver terminal transmits the subsequent information request, as many subsequent information requests are transmitted as there are broadcast channels specified in the subsequent information request (see fig.7; the

terminal information comprises channel information of the program information, col.2, lines 59-60; a plurality of broadcasting channel, col.12, lines 65-66).

Re claim 19, Kambayashi et al disclose wherein the step of generating the subsequent information request, comprises adding at least one selection criterion to the initial request (the broadcasting unit 1a updates, e.g., the last figure of the terminal ID, changes the terminal designation information, multiplexes terminal control information including the updated information with a video signal, and distributes it to the audience, Col.20. lines 38-43).

Re claim 20, is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 1.

Re claim 21, Kambayashi et al disclose wherein the description server includes means for making an initial request available (see fig.10, receive information from server and display it).

Re claim 22, Kambayashi et al disclose wherein the system includes at least one audiovisual content broadcast server said server including means for transmitting initial requests together with the broadcast content (multiplexes terminal control information including the updated information with a video signal, and distributes it to the audience, col.20, lines 38-42; see fig.1, element 1c, broadcasting station server).

Re claim 23, Kambayashi et al disclose including transmission means for transmitting the initial request together with the broadcast content (multiplexes terminal control information including the updated information with a video signal, and distributes it to the audience, col.20, lines 38-42).

Re claim 24, Kambayashi et al disclose wherein the transmission means are regular transmission means (transmission means for transmitting both the ID of the event and

the terminal information acquired by the terminal information acquisition means to the broadcasting station server through a two-way communication line based on the destination information acquired by the destination information acquisition means, col.4, lines 49-54; that means a regular transmission where there is communication in both ways).

Re claim 25, is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 1.

Re claim 26, is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 21.

Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kambayashi et al in view of Gordon in further view of Legall et al, US No. 6005565.

Re claim 9, Kambayashi in view of Gordon did not explicitly disclose wherein the time interval is defined by a start date and time and by an end date and time.

However, Legall et al disclose wherein the time interval is defined by a start date and time and by an end date and time (start time and end time, col.4, line 7).

It would have been obvious for any person of ordinary skill in the art at that time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Legall into the invention of Kambayashi as modified by Gordon for the purpose of knowing the running time of the program.

Re claim 10, Kambayashi in view of Gordon did not explicitly disclose wherein the time interval is defined by a start date and time and by duration.

However, Legall et al disclose wherein the time interval is defined by a start date and time (and by duration(duration of the program, col.4, line 8; start time and end time, col.4, line 7).

It would have been obvious for any person of ordinary skill in the art at that time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Legall into the invention of Kambayashi as modified by Gordon for the purpose of knowing the running time of the program.

Re claim 11, Kambayashi in view of Gordon did not explicitly disclose wherein during the request generation step, the initial request is extended by specifying keywords corresponding to the names of description elements for broadcast audiovisual content.

However, Legall et al disclose wherein during the request generation step, the initial request is extended by specifying keywords corresponding to the names of description elements for broadcast audiovisual content(the information associated with a broadcast can be more than just a sequence of keywords. Keywords can be combined with logical syntactic operators such as AND, OR and NOT to produce Boolean combinations of search terms and to provide a more intelligent query, col.5, lines 23-28).

It would have been obvious for any person of ordinary skill in the art at that time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Legall into the invention of Kambayashi as modified by Gordon for the purpose of making the request more specific in including keyword to it.

Re claim 12, Kambayashi in view of Gordon did not explicitly disclose wherein following the step of receiving description data, the method returns to the request generation step in order to generate at least one new request associated with a new date and a new time corresponding to the end-of-broadcast date and time for the audiovisual content for which description data has just been received.

However, Legall et al disclose wherein following the step of receiving description data, the method returns to the request generation step in order to generate at least one new

request associated with a new date and a new time corresponding to the end-of-broadcast date and time for the audiovisual content for which description data has just been received (maintaining logs of searches performed for subsequent references, col.3, lines 6-7; see fig.5, element 516, edit; that means the user can update the search by adding new time to a previous search).

It would have been obvious for any person of ordinary skill in the art at that time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Legall into the invention of Kambayashi as modified by Gordon for the purpose of keeping track of all requests made by the user..

Claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kambayashi in view of Gordon further in view of Kimchi et al, US No. 20020147814.

Re claim 15, Kambayashi in view of Gordon did not explicitly disclose wherein the step of acquiring and storing an initial request comprises a broadcast server supplying an SDP type file corresponding to an address field of a description server.

However, Kimchi et al disclose wherein the step of acquiring and storing an initial request comprises a broadcast server supplying an SDP type file corresponding to an address field of a description server (the devices provide a description of their capabilities to the terminal server using a protocol such as SDP, H.245, HTML, XML, IETF ConnNeg or any proprietary mean, 0078).

It would have been obvious for any person of ordinary skill in the art at that time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Kimchi into the invention of Kambayashi as modified by Gordon for the purpose of using file having address defining a server.

Re claim 16, Kambayashi in view of Gordon did not explicitly disclose wherein the description data is supplied in the form of an XML file.

However, Kimchi et al wherein the description data is supplied in the form of an XML file (the devices provide a description of their capabilities to the terminal server using a protocol such as SDP, H.245, HTML, XML, IETF ConnNeg or any proprietary mean, 0078).

It would have been obvious for any person of ordinary skill in the art at that time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Kimchi into the invention of Kambayashi as modified by Gordon for the purpose of using XML file as description data.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jean Duclos Saintcy whose phone number is 571-270-3224. The examiner can normally reach on M-F 7:30-5:00 PM EST. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are not successful, his supervisor, Brian Pendleton, can be reached on 571-272-7527. The fax number for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, dial 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jean Duclos Saintcyrr/

/Brian T. Pendleton/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2425